

**MINUTES
LAKE COUNTY
MT. PLYMOUTH-SORRENTO
PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

JUNE 13, 2007

The Mt. Plymouth-Sorrento Planning Advisory Committee met on Wednesday, June 13, 2007 at 3:30 p.m. at the Sorrento Christian Center, 32441 CR 437N, Sorrento, Florida. The Mt. Plymouth-Sorrento Planning Advisory Committee is an advisory committee for continued planning efforts within the Mt. Plymouth-Sorrento area as defined in Ordinance 2004-67.

Members Present:

G. Curtis Duffield, President
Priscilla Bernardo-Drugge, Vice-President
Betty Ann Christian, Secretary

Tim Bailey
Dr. Ronald Holman
Clark Morris

Jeanne Etter
Judy Weis
Jeff Richardson

Members Absent:

Scott Taylor
Minnie Bollar

Staff Present:

Wayne Bennett, AICP, Growth Management, Planning & Community Design
Director
Donna Bohrer, Public Hearing Coordinator, Planning & Community Design
Karen Ginsberg, Senior Planner, Planning & Community Design
Rick Hartenstein, Senior Planner, Planning & Community Design
Ashley Sneed, Planning Intern, Planning & Community Design

Guests:

Keith Schue, Local Planning Agency member
Peggy Belflower, Local Planning Agency member

G. Curtis Duffield, President, called the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m. and noted that a Quorum was present. He confirmed that Proof of Publication was on file in the Planning and Development Services Division and that the meeting had been noticed pursuant to the Sunshine Statute.

MOTION by Clark Morris, SECONDED by Jeanne Etter to approve the minutes from the May 9, 2007 meeting as presented.

FOR: Duffield, Bernardo-Drugge, Bailey, Christian, Etter, Holman, Weiss, Richardson, Morris

ABSENT: Bollar, Taylor

AGAINST: None

MOTION PASSED: 9-0

President Curtis Duffield thanked Clark Morris for books he had given to the committee members. He also thanked Donna Bohrer for the minutes, Wayne Bennett and Karen Ginsberg for their assistance drafting the focus questions for this meeting.

Wayne Bennett, AICP, Planning & Community Design Director, said staff had prepared three (3) focus questions based on the draft policies approved by the MPSPAC.

The first question focused on Policy 1.4.4, regarding a balance of land uses within the Main Street Corridor. He said this balance of uses could be market driven with no requirements or requirements could be corridor-based as a whole or site-based.

There was discussion on the difference between Future Land Use and the use of land, plus permitted uses. Tim Bailey said the land uses he could envision for the Main Street District today would be different from land uses in the future. Mr. Bennett said the first step was controlling uses; the next step was considering and planning for the future. Priscilla Bernardo-Drugge was concerned about the impact of traffic generated by the uses they will be proposing. She did not want these uses to adversely affect the amount or flow of traffic. Mr. Bennett said the amount of available road capacity would determine how much additional traffic could be generated by the Main Street Corridor before the Level of Service (LOS) was exceeded.

President Duffield asked about vertical integration of uses. Mr. Bennett said whether or not uses were mixed vertically depended on which characteristics of the community they wanted to preserve. Tim Bailey suggested they focus on what they would like to create. There was discussion about what specific uses the committee would consider under Civic Uses.

There was discussion on how to achieve the desired mix of uses; requiring a mix of uses on each site; using a point system; limiting or balancing the uses so one is not out of balance with another use and requiring a percentage of uses. There was discussion about sustaining the development. Mr. Bennett said the variety of site size in the Main Street Corridor would be an advantage because scales could be blended with the resulting variety of sites and buildings creating character. He asked if they wanted to require small sites to mix uses in the same way as larger sites. He thought the character of smaller sites should be protected.

Keith Schue discussed having one zoning district for the entire corridor or having different districts which would give more control. Mr. Bennett thought a point system

within a single zoning district could give more control over the mix of uses.

Jeff Richardson said he saw the corridor with a minimum set of regulations because he thought site-specific regulations could create problems. He said they could treat the zoning districts as planned districts. Jeanne Etter thought the site specific approach could lead to disputes.

Mr. Bennett said he understood the consensus to be, required mixed uses on each development site, with the smallest sites exempt and he suggested the largest ones should have to incorporate three different uses.

Ms. Drugge suggested locating primary uses, such as office and retail, at the intersections and to have residential and office uses in between, which would blend the uses. President Duffield suggested using the term “professional” instead of “office.” Mr. Bennett said he understood there was consensus that the primary uses at intersection areas would not be residential, and that residential would be the primary use in the areas between those intersections. He called these two different areas “use districts.” Mr. Richardson said having a “planned district” would increase the potential for negotiation with developers.

Noting that developers do not generally want to build for civic uses, Mr. Bennett asked the committee for suggestions. Ms. Drugge suggested identifying areas for civic uses and then using incentives. Mr. Bennett suggested identifying key sites for civic uses.

FOCUS QUESTION #2

There was discussion about how to locate parking and different parking patterns. Mr. Morris discussed street parking to calm traffic and to make pedestrians feel safe. Large parking lots were also discussed. Ms. Etter suggested tailoring the parking pattern to the particular use.

There was discussion about the relationship between buildings, parking and the street. Mr. Richardson suggested parking locations could be set by percentage. There was agreement with having a variety of parking styles. Mr. Bennett said parking regulations could be written to maintain the current parking pattern on individual sites when redevelopment occurs. He added that the regulations could require new developments to have parking patterns different than those used by the neighboring properties, to ensure variety. Mr. Bailey said rear parking could be used primarily by cars and service vehicles and that the front parking would be directed more towards pedestrian or alternative transportation. Mr. Bennett discussed an alternative parking system with a limited access road for parking, which will function as a traffic calming device. There was discussion on how to limit this type of parking and the advantages of shared parking particularly with regard to civic uses. Mr. Bennett said that access management would place limitations on this type of parking.

There was discussion about shared parking between businesses and parking for civic uses, including a possible farm market use. There was agreement to delay consideration of these options until the next meeting.

FOCUS QUESTION #3

Mr. Bennett said the maximum density was five and a half dwelling units per acre and asked if the intention was to apply that equally over the entire Main Street District. There was discussion on mixed uses and controlling those uses by using the Floor Area Ratio (FAR). Rick Hartenstein, Senior Planner, suggested combining the density calculation and the FAR together. Mr. Bennett explained that by using only FAR regulations that the residential units get smaller, if FAR and density are combined then the unit calculation is separate from the square footage. Judy Weiss questioned the feasibility of apartments located above businesses in this area. Mr. Bennett said the 5.5 density would allow town houses. He said the 5.5 could allow 55 units on 10 acres, which would allow all of the units in one building as long it conformed to the height restriction. There was agreement among the committee that this was not it's intention.

The committee thanked Mr. Bennett for his assistance.

NEW BUSINESS

Dr. Holman discussed the East Lake County Chamber's newsletter and asked Pam Jennelle from the Chamber to explain the availability of the "Communicator" newsletter on the Chamber's website. She said it is now possible for non-members of the Chamber to receive the newsletter and additional community information by subscribing to those e-mails.

Dr. Holman said he had met with Commissioner Stewart regarding scheduling work sessions for the Committee so they can set a direction for their work. He addressed Sunshine Law issues. President Duffield said he would support scheduling a work session. There was agreement to consult with the County Attorney regarding the Sunshine Law restrictions and to ask staff to contact the members to find a date.

Jeanne Etter discussed the County criteria for naming parks after particular individuals, the Committee's desire to have the new park named for Tommy Hight and that another individual was also being considered. Dr. Holman said the Chamber has suggested a compromise by naming the park, the East Lake County Memorial Park. They were further suggesting an area within the park to recognize other individuals from the community. There was agreement to further discuss this at the next meeting after Ms. Etter meets with the County Parks Director.

Clark Morris said he had met with the Concerned Citizens of East Lake County and they had suggested public, community meetings to discuss topics of community interest. The Sunshine Law addressing the legal advertisements for this type of meeting was discussed.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Pam Jennelle explained how the Chamber has been advertising their meetings because several MPSPAC members were also members of the Chamber.

A gentleman from the audience, identified as Tony, said there was already a Sorrento

Park.

Dr. Kent Greer, DVM, said this was his first meeting and discussed a letter he had received from a citizen's group regarding the land use on his property.

Ms. Etter explained that the information in that letter was incorrect and invited him to attend their meetings. She said it was not the intent of this committee to take away anyone's property rights. She said several groups in the County were sending out similar letters.

Keith Schue suggested the MPSPAC analyze the impacts of their decisions.

Lou Fabrizio briefly addressed some the parking issues.

MOTION by Priscilla Bernardo-Drugge, SECONDED by Clark Morris to adjourn.
FOR: **Duffield, Bernardo-Drugge, Bailey, Christian, Etter,**
Holman, Weiss, Richardson, Morris
ABSENT: **Bollar, Taylor**
AGAINST: **None**
MOTION PASSED: **9-0**

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 5:52 p.m.

Donna R. Bohrer
Public Hearing Coordinator

Betty Ann Christian
Secretary